



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,104	03/06/2001	Frank Bähren	Westphal.6123	3956

7590 04/05/2004

Patrick J. O'Shea, Esq.  
Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens, LLP  
Suite 3300  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER
----------

HERNANDEZ, OLGA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/801,104	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BÄHREN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Olga Hernandez	<b>Art Unit</b> 3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/12/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the 103 rejection based on an improper obvious statement. The examiner disagrees. It has been held that omission of an element and its function in a combination where the remaining elements perform the same functions involves only routine skill in the art. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184. In a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 103, the reference teachings must somehow be modified in order to meet the claims. The modification must be one that would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See MPEP § 2131 - § 2146 for guidance on patentability determinations under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103. 35 U.S.C. 103 authorizes a rejection where, to meet the claim, it is necessary to modify a single reference or to combine it with one or more other references. After indicating that the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. 103, the examiner should set forth in the Office action:

- (A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate,
- (B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s),
- (C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and
- (D) an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met.

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or

in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). See MPEP § 2144 - § 2144.09 for examples of reasoning supporting obviousness rejections.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ise (6,240,361).

As per claims 1, 7 and 13, Ise teaches:

- a position sensor that senses the geographic position of the navigation system and provides a first navigation system position signal indicative thereof (figure 2(1) and 7);
- a data bus (figure 1);
- receiving the first navigation system position signal and transmits onto the data bus (i) a first position signal indicative of the position of a trip starting location, (ii) a second position signal indicative of a trip destination location, and (iii) the first navigation system position signal (column 3, lines 45-50, column 4, lines 35-43 and figure 1);
- a monitor unit that includes:
  - o a memory device that includes map data (figure 1);
  - o a display device responsive to the image data, to display an initial image indicative of the image data (figures 2-7);
- wherein the navigation computing unit receives a second navigation position signal indicative of a new position of the navigation system and transmits the second navigation position signal over the data bus to the monitor computing unit, which generates revised image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and

the updates position of the navigation system, which is provided for display on the display device (column 4, lines 35-43 and figures 2-7).

While the present invention uses two different devices for receiving from the data bus (i) the first position signal, (ii) the second position signal and (iii) the received navigation system position signal, and accesses the memory device to generate initial image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and the current position of the navigation system. The prior art uses only one. So, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use two different units in order to share responsibility and provide faster respond.

As per claims 2 and 9, Ise teaches the use of a GPS receiver (figure 1).

As per claim 3, the use of longitude and latitude data is obvious.

As per claims 4, 5, 8 and 12, Morimoto teaches the same invention claimed by the applicant (figures 2, 4, 6 and 7).

As per claim 6, it is obvious the use of WGS 84 Standard.

As per claim 10, it is obvious the use of the MOST bus.

As per claim 11, it is obvious the use of the MML bus.

3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al (5,821,880).

As per claims 1, 7 and 13, Morimoto teaches:

- a position sensor that senses the geographic position of the navigation system and provides a first navigation system position signal indicative thereof (figure 1);

- a data bus (figure 1);
- a navigation computing unit that receives the first navigation system position signal and transmits onto the data bus (i) a first position signal indicative of the position of a trip starting location, (ii) a second position signal indicative of a trip destination location, and (iii) the first navigation system position signal (column 6, lines 45-55 and abstract);
- a monitor unit that includes:
  - o a memory device that includes map data (figure 1);
  - o a display device responsive to the image data, to display an initial image indicative of the image data (column 1, lines 25-32);
- wherein the navigation computing unit receives a second navigation position signal indicative of a new position of the navigation system and transmits the second navigation position signal over the data bus to the monitor computing unit, which generates revised image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and the updates position of the navigation system, which is provided for display on the display device (column 6, lines 55-63).

While the present invention uses two different devices for receiving from the data bus (i) the first position signal, (ii) the second position signal and (iii) the received navigation system position signal, and accesses the memory device to generate initial image data including map data indicative of the trip starting location, the trip destination and the current position of the navigation system. The prior art uses only one. So, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to use two different units in order to share responsibility and provide faster respond.

As per claims 2 and 9, Morimoto teaches the use of a GPS receiver (figure 1).

As per claim 3, the use of longitude and latitude data is inherent.

As per claims 4, 5, 8 and 12, Morimoto teaches the same invention claimed by the applicant (figures 2-4, 17, 18, 21, 25-27).

As per claim 6, it is obvious the use of WGS 84 Standard.

As per claim 10, it is obvious the use of the MOST bus.

As per claim 11, it is obvious the use of the MML bus.

#### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.




Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Hernandez whose telephone number is (703) 305-0918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A. Cuchlinski can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Olga Hernandez  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3661



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600